Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/816,452	ROBERTS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	NEAL R. SEREBOFF	3626
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Allowance</u>	
(1) <u>NEAL R. SEREBOFF</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Carol Peters, 45010</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 27 January 2010	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: none		
Claims discussed: 1/26		
Prior art documents discussed: none		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.		
/N. R. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 3626	(Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/816,452

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Multiple interviews occurred over weeks. The Examiner noted allowability in December. Several discussions over specific language then occurred. Each conversation was then broken by many days while the Attorney awaited client language approval. The 2nd preliminary amendment was submitted in direct response to Examiner question. In addition, the final Examiner's amendment was done to avoid potential 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph confusion, also at Examiner's request.